

Mr. BROWN said that to obviate one of the many difficulties which the introduction of the resolution was designed to prevent, he would move the previous question.

Mr. JENIFER. I made a motion that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN suggested that the gentleman had withdrawn it.

Mr. JENIFER said he had done so only at the request of the gentleman from Baltimore city, (Mr. BRENT.)

Mr. BRENT thereupon renewed the motion to lay on the table—at the same time, of course, indicating his intention to vote against it. And, he asked the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

And the question having been taken, the vote resulted as follows :

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Lee, Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Kent, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Jenifer, Ridgely, John Dennis, James U. Dennis, Williams, Hodson, Goldsborough, McLane, Sprigg, McCubbin, George, Wright, Annan and Holliday—26.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Dent, Mitchell, Bell, Welsh, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, Crisfield, Dashiell, Hicks, Eccleston, Phelps, Chambers of Cecil, McCullough, Miller, Dirickson, McMaster, Hearn, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, McHenry, Magraw, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Gwinn, Brent of Balt. city, Ware, Fiery, Neill, Jr., John Newcomer, Harbine, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Weber, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower, Cockey and Brown—48.

So the resolution was not laid on the table, and the question recurring on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RIDGELY, said he had desired to see the proposition laid upon the table, not because he objected to the principle of it, but because he thought that it covered too much ground.—An order had been adopted changing the daily hour of meeting to ten o'clock. The resolution now under consideration provided that the name of every member not present at the call of the roll, should be entered on the Journal unless he should report himself before adjournment. Now it was obvious, from the proceedings which had taken place this morning, that if the roll was to be called at ten o'clock, and this resolution was to be adopted, it would be found that no quorum was present, and that a portion of every day would be occupied in notifying the Secretary what members were present. He (Mr. R.) would suggest that the Convention should, in the first place, go back to a proper hour of meeting—eleven o'clock. Let that be done, and he would then go for the proposition before them, and live up to it. If members were not then present, let their names be recorded thus and so.

He thought that no great object could be effected by meeting before eleven. A number of members were upon committees which met between the hours of 9 and 11. It would be very

inconvenient to gentlemen who were in the Convention five or six hours during the day, and upon committees in the morning and at night, to meet here at ten, and if this resolution was to be adopted, he hoped it would be with the qualification he suggested as to the hour of meeting. And he proposed an amendment to that effect (to precede the resolution.)

Mr. HARBINE said, he hoped that the amendment would not prevail. In his opinion, the hour often was not too early an hour for the commencement of the business of the Convention. He doubted whether there was any Convention now in session, which met later than ten. It was late enough, if gentlemen looked to the time that the Convention had been in session, or to the present state of its business. He disclaimed the vocation of a lecturer. It was probably as much his fault as the fault of any other member of the Convention, that things were in the condition in which they now stand. He could not claim for himself to have been altogether free from the charge of inattention to duty. He could not and would not shut his eye to the fact that very little progress had been made in the public business and he coincided entirely in the remarks which had been made on that point by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. BRENT). It was that the Convention should meet at an early hour, and should go seriously to work, that its business might be disposed of.

He denied the validity of the argument which had been urged as respected the business of the committees, or the difficulty of procuring the attendance of gentlemen at the hour designated. He believed that when the hour was once known and understood, gentlemen would be punctual in the discharge of their duties; and if they would not, the fault and the responsibility would rest upon them.

Mr. Hicks sent up to the Secretary's table an amendment (by way of substitute) which he desired to offer.

The PRESIDENT thought that the amendment was not now in order.

Mr. WEBER demanded the previous question, and by ayes 34, noes 29, there was a second.

Mr. DORSEY rose to move an amendment.

The PRESIDENT intimated that no amendment was now in order, the previous question having been recorded. The main question was then ordered to be taken, which main question was, first, on the amendment of Mr. RIDGELY (fixing eleven as the hour of meeting.)

Mr. JOHN NEWCOMER called the yeas and nays, which were ordered and were as follows :

*Affirmative.*—Messrs. Chapman, President, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers of Kent, Mitchell, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Sellman, Weems, Dalrymple, Bond, Jenifer, Ridgely, John Dennis, Crisfield, Williams, Hicks, Hodson, Goldsborough, Phelps, Miller, McLane, Sprigg, McCubbin, Wright, Stewart of Caroline, Hardcastle, Brent of Baltimore city, Kilgour, Waters and Hollyday.—34.

*Negative.*—Messrs. Dent, Lee, Kent, Bell, Welch, Sherwood, of Talbot, Colston, James U.